

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

ELOUISE PEPION COBELL, et al.,)	
Appellees,)	No. 03-5262
)	
v.)	
)	
GALE A. NORTON, as Secretary of)	
the Interior, et al,)	
Appellants)	
)	
)	
)	

**APPELLANTS' MOTION TO HOLD
APPEAL IN ABEYANCE**

Pursuant to Rule 27, Fed. R. App. P., appellants hereby

334 F.3d 1128 (D.C. Cir. 2003), and Cobell v. Norton, 240 F.3d 1081 (D.C. Cir. 2001).

In the ruling at issue on this appeal, the district court entered a preliminary injunction requiring the Department of Interior to disconnect from the Internet all Information Technology Systems that house or access Individual Indian Trust

disconnection if the government certifies to the court's satisfaction that a system is essential for the protection against fires or threats to life or property, or that a system

either (a) does not house or access Individual Indian Trust Data, or (b) is secure from Internet access by unauthorized users.

The court entered this preliminary injunction on July 28, 2003. The court has not yet evaluated the certifications submitted by the government pursuant to the preliminary injunction or ordered the Department of Interior to disconnect systems from the Internet.

2. On September 25, 2003, after a 44-day trial, the district court issued a "structural injunction" that precludes implementation of the historical accounting plan developed by the Department of Interior and asserts judicial control over virtually all aspects of the management of Individual Indian Money accounts. The 18-page structural injunction was accompanied by a 272-page opinion addressing historical accounting and a 79-page opinion addressing trust reform generally. See Cobell v. Norton, No. 96-1285, 2003 WL 22211405 (D.D.C. Sept. 25, 2003).

The structural injunction is appealable as of right under 28 U.S.C. 1292(a)(1). The decision whether to appeal rests with the Solicitor General of the United States. A notice of appeal would be due November 24, 2003.

3. The preliminary injunction and the structural injunction are closely related, and in the government's view, the injunctions exceed the district court's jurisdiction for many of

the same reasons. The government thus requests that the above-captioned appeal be held in abeyance while the Solicitor General determines whether to appeal from the structural injunction. If an appeal is taken from that ruling, it may be appropriate to consolidate the two appeals for briefing and argument.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER D. KEISLER
Assistant Attorney General

GREGORY G. KATSAS
Deputy Assistant Attorney
General

ROBERT E. KOPP
MARK B. STERN
THOMAS M. BONDY
CHARLES SCARBOROUGH
ALISA B. KLEIN
(202) 514-5089
Attorneys, Appellate Staff
Civil Division, Room 9108
Department of Justice
601 D Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20530

OCTOBER 2003

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 29th day of October, 2003, I caused copies of the foregoing motion to be sent to the Court and to the following by hand delivery:

The Honorable Royce C. Lamberth
United States District Court
United States Courthouse
Third and Constitution Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Keith M. Harper
Native American Rights Fund
1712 N Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-2976
(202) 785-4166

and to the following by federal express, overnight mail:

Elliott H. Levitas
Law Office of Elliott H. Levitas
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, GA 30309-4530
(404) 815-6450

and to the following by regular, first class mail:

Dennis Marc Gingold
Law Office of Dennis Marc Gingold
607 14th Street, N.W., Box 6
Washington, D.C. 20005

Earl Old Person (pro se)
Blackfeet Tribe
P.O. Box 850
Browning, MT 59417

Alisa B. Klein